REMARKS

Specification

The Examiner indicated that the use of the trademark XMLTM, HTTPTM, FTPTM etc. in page 5 and subsequent pages should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

It is respectfully submitted that XML, HTTP, and FIP are acronyms and not trademarks. The words from which the acronyms have been derived have been added to the paragraph beginning on page 5, line 4. These acronyms only appear on page 5.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 8 are objected to because of informalities: in the preamble of the claims 1 and 8 in page 13, line 7, and page 16, line 24, where ';' has been used. Appropriate correction is required.

With respect to claims 1 and 8, the claims have been amended to delete the ";" and insert a -,- therefor.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 6, and 13-15 rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul Hinckley (USPUB 2002/0055886, hereinafter "Hinckley") in view of Joseph Gatto (USPN 6,681,211, hereinafter "Gatto").

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection since the Applicants' claimed combination, as exemplified in claim 1, includes the limitations not disclosed in Hinckley or Gatto of:

"(1) determining via the system if the output/input interface of the manufacturer submits a data uploading request, wherein if no uploading request is submitted, step (3) is followed; or else, the system receives manufacture associated data of client order data, material requirement data and stock record data that are uploaded by the manufacturer, and stores the uploaded data in a database of the system, and then step (2) is followed;

- (2) processing data operation for the manufacture associated data of the client order data, the material requirement data and stock record data, and storing operation data results of manufacture schedule data, order reply data, abnormal condition data and material insufficiency data in the database; then, the step (1) is followed;
- (3) determining via the system if the manufacturer submits a data downloading request, wherein if the downloading request is submitted, step (4) is followed; or else, the step (1) of followed; and
- (4) downloading operation data results from the database corresponding to the submitted request from the manufacturer, and transmitting the downloaded operation data results to the output/input interface of the manufacturer."

With regard to step (1) of claim 1, Hinckley page 11, paragraph [0121], taken as a whole teaches a logistics user interface which may be configured to provide access to data, and that "access to this data can greatly reduce the amount of manpower necessary to avoid time delays in shipping and receiving components". However, Hinckley does not teach or suggest the steps of determining if the output/input interface of the manufacturer submits a data uploading request, if no request is submitted to go to step (3), or else receive the uploaded data and store said data in a database. That is, Hinckley does not comprise a determining step according to what request is received to determine the next step.

With regard to step (2) of claim 1, Hinckley page 11, paragraph [0123], teaches that exchange system traders may access the exchange system to generate additional trades. However, Hinckley does not teach or suggest a processing data operation. Hinckley, therefore, does not teach or suggest information of manufacture associated data of the client order data, material requirement data, or a stock record. Hinckley, therefore, also does not teach or suggest storing operation data results of manufacture schedule data, order reply data, abnormal condition data, and material insufficiency data in the database as claimed in Applicant's step (2).

In addition, the claimed method is executed by the present invention without human involvement in step (2). Hinckley requires a human trader to access the exchange system. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Hinckley does not teach or suggest step (2).

With regard to step (3) of claim 1, Hinckley page 6, paragraph [0070], teaches downloading or inputting data provided by trading partners. However, Hinckley does not teach or suggest a determining step according to what request is received, as defined in

Applicant's step (3) that if manufacturer submits downloading request, to go to step (4), or else to go to step (1).

With regard to step (4) claim 1, Hinckley page 11, paragraph [0121], does not teach or suggest downloading operation data results and transmitting the downloaded data results to the output/input interface.

And the Examiner admits that Hinckley does not explicitly indicate the claimed estimating exportation time.

Gatto taken as a whole, and more specifically in col. 25, lines 50-63, teaches that a user may click on the Define/Select button to bring up a Field Specifier window, where the user may select the fields and format for an export file of backtest results. However, the above subject matter in Gatto does not teach, suggest, or mention the claimed estimating exportation time of Applicants' invention.

Consequently, Hinckley and Gatto, taken as wholes individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed steps of Applicants' independent claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Hinckley and Gatto, and should be allowed.

With respect to claim 6, this dependent claim depends from independent claim 1 and is believed to be allowable since it contains all the limitations set forth in the independent claim from which it depends and claims unobvious combinations thereof.

With respect to independent claim 13, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection since the Applicants' claimed combination, as exemplified in claim 1, includes the limitations not disclosed in Hinckley or Gatto of:

- "(1) determining via a request input module for receiving the data uploading request or the data downloading request from the output/input interface of the manufacturer, and for generating a processing signal corresponding to the data uploading request or the data downloading request;
- a control module for receiving the processing signal from the request input module, and for outputting a controlling signal according to the received processing signal, wherein the control module includes a storage interface, a schedule interface and a retrieval interface;

a first database for storing the manufacture associated data of the client order data, the material requirement data and the stock record data uploaded by the manufacturer; wherein if the control module receives the processing signal from the request input module corresponding to the data uploading request, it generates an uploading controlling signal for prompting the storage interface to store the uploaded manufacture associated data in the first database, and generates an operation controlling signal for prompting the schedule interface to retrieve the uploaded data from the first database for data operation and processing;

a second database for storing operation data results of manufacture schedule data, order reply data, abnormal condition data and material insufficiency data produced by the control module; wherein if the control module receives the processing signal from the request input module corresponding to the data downloading request, it generates a downloading controlling signal for prompting the retrieval interface to retrieve the operation data results of the manufacture schedule data, the order reply data, the abnormal condition data and the material insufficiency data from the second database as desirably used as reference for product manufacture; and

an output control module for transmitting the retrieved data of the manufacture schedule data, the order reply data, the abnormal condition data and the material insufficiency data to the output/input interface of the manufacturer, so as to allow the manufacturer to be able to control product manufacture for exportation on time and monitor stock quantity in real time."

As to the request input module, Hinckley page 6, paragraph [0070] and FIG. 9 taken as a whole teaches that, at 910, ASC data is accessed, e.g., by downloading or inputting that data provided by trading partners, accessing this data previously stored in a memory, etc. However, Hinckley does not teach, suggest, or mention a request input module, and also does not teach or suggest the step of generating a processing signal corresponding to the data uploading request or the data downloading request.

As to the control module, Hinckley page 11, paragraph [0121] teaches that data may be stored in the MPR data structure; however, the alleged Hinckley's control module does not comprise a schedule interface and retrieval interface, and does not receive a processing signal from the request input module and does not output a controlling signal according to the received processing signal, as in Applicant's claimed invention.

As to the first database, Hinckley page 6, paragraph [0070] and page 11, paragraph [0121] do not teach, suggest, or mention a control module generating an uploading controlling signal and generating an operation controlling signal.

As to the second database, Hinckley's page 6, paragraph [0070] also does not teach, suggest, or mention a control module generating a downloading controlling signal.

The Examiner admits that Hinckley does not explicitly indicate the claimed estimating exportation time.

Gatto also does not teach, suggest, or mention the step of estimating exportation time for the same reason as indicated in the remarks to claim 1 above.

Consequently, Hinckley and Gatto, taken as wholes individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed steps of Applicants' independent claim 13. It is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is patentable over Hinckley and Gatto, and should be allowed.

With respect to claims 14 and 15, these dependent claims respectively depend from independent claim 13 and are believed to be allowable since they contain all the limitations set forth in the independent claim from which they depend and claim additional unobvious combinations thereof.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 6, and 13-15 are allowable under 35 USC §103(a) as being patentable over Hinckley in view of Gatto because, taken as wholes, neither teaches, suggests, or mentions the claimed elements so as to make the claimed combination obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-5, 7, and 16-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's designation of allowable subject matter and respectfully submit that the remaining claims contain additional allowable subject matter.

P. 19

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested. Allowance of claims 1-19 at an early date is solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0374 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Milio Sahman

Mikio Ishimaru

Registration No. 27,449

The Law Offices of Mikio Ishimaru 1110 Sunnyvale-Saratoga Rd., Suite A1 Sunnyvale, CA 94087

Telephone: (408) 738-0592

Fax: (408) 738-0881 Date: July 28, 2004